

## **REMARKS**

The Applicant has filed the present Response in reply to the Official Action of August 24, 2005, and the Applicant believes the Response to be fully responsive to the Official Action for the reasons set forth below in greater detail.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-26 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trimble et al., “US. 6,788,199”. [sic] (hereinafter “Trimble”) in view of Crabtree et al., United States Patent No., 6,788,199 (hereinafter “Crabtree”).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s rejection and traverses with at least the following analysis. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that neither reference teaches as “security system” as recited in the independent claims. Specifically, the hypothetically combined references, whether taken alone or in any combination thereof, fail to teach (i) security system with an object locator feature, as recited in Claim 1; (ii) a method for providing an object locator feature for a security system, comprising: storing identifiers for electronic tags associated with a plurality of objects, and storing descriptive information for the plurality of objects, in a memory associated with a user interface device of the security system, as recited in Claim 11; (iii) a program storage device, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine to perform a method for providing an object locator feature for a security system, the method comprising the steps of: storing identifiers for electronic tags associated with a plurality of objects, and storing descriptive information for the plurality of objects, in a memory associated with a user interface device of the security system, as recited in Claim 16; and (iv) a security system with an object polling feature, as recited in Claim 25.

Applicant submits that the Examiner is misinterpreting the phrase “a security system” as used in the claims and the references. Trimble states that:

While in preferred embodiments the **electronic locator circuit 136** is integrated into a vehicle key, the invention can be used in other applications such as for mounting the electronic locator circuit on a house key, for example. Moreover, the **electronic locator circuit, in chip form**, can be integrated into other cases, enclosures, luggage, glass cases, remote controllers for activating and deactivating vehicle and **home security systems**, portable telephones, cell phones, portable computers, hand-held electronic organizers, miniature electronic devices of the type that are adapted to be worn on the wrist, for example, of the user and which can be used for providing internet access, hand-held computers, etc. The electronic locator circuit, in chip form or on a printed circuit board, can be integrated into remote controllers for activating and deactivating after-market vehicle and home security systems.

Paragraph 134.

Applicant does not dispute that an object locator circuit or tag can be embedded in an interface device (or in any device), Applicant is not claiming this feature; however, Applicant submits that this section does not teach the claimed security system, i.e., a security system that can be used to find a plurality of objects. The claimed invention is not an electric tag for general use as an object locator, but an electronic tag for a specific use with an object locator feature of a security system.

Crabtree fails to supply the missing teaching as identified above, i.e., does not teach a “security system” as claimed.

Additionally, while an object locator can be considered to be used for “security”, it is not a “security system” within the meaning and spirit of the invention. Furthermore, having a temperature and acceleration sensor is not a “security system”.

In contrast, the claimed invention incorporates the location feature into an existing **security system**. The claimed invention claims an object locator feature that can be **integrated into an existing security system**, such as in a home or small business. The claimed security

system refers to a security system that is used in a home or a business to deter burglaries and detect fires. The term “security” thus encompasses security from intrusion, as well as fire. Other hazards such as carbon monoxide may also be monitored. A security system, as disclosed in an embodiment of the invention, includes a central control panel 110 that communicates with a number of sensors via a wired or wireless path. The security system further includes a user interface device 140 that may be the primary interface between the human user and the security system 100. The user interface device 140 is commonly provided as a wireless device to allow it to be permanently installed in the home without running wire, such as by affixing it to a wall.

The security system implements wireless components that can transmit and/or receive wireless signals. The user interface device 140 may have both transmit and receive capabilities to communicate with the control panel 110.

Each wireless component of the security system must be “learned” by the control 114. In the learning process, data is stored in the non-volatile memory 115 that identifies the characteristics of each sensor, including the sensor type, serial number or other identifier, and what type of action to take based on signals received from each sensor.

As noted above, the claimed invention incorporates the object locator feature into an existing security system such that the invention can take advantage of the existing wireless network, circuitry, and structure, as mentioned above. That is, existing wireless communication components and transmitting and receiving protocols of the control panel 110 and/or user interface device 140 is used.

Additionally, even if the reference taught a “security system” none of the references enable one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an object locator feature or function into the security system.


Accordingly, Applicant submits that the hypothetically combined references fail to teach, suggest or render obvious each and every limitation of the independent claims and, therefore, the claims are patentably distinct therefrom.

Applicant submits that the dependent claims are patentably distinct from the cited reference based at least upon the above-identified analysis.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-26 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the Examiner to allow the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Seth Weinfeld  
Registration No: 50,929

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.  
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

SW:ae